Minnoonolia MN

§ 52.109

defined as the acquisition of more toll free numbers than one intends to use for the provision of toll free service, as well as the sale of a toll free number by a private entity for a fee, is contrary to the public interest in the conservation of the scarce toll free number resource and contrary to the FCC's responsibility to promote the orderly use and allocation of toll free numbers.

§52.109 Permanent cap on number reservations.

- (a) A Responsible Organization may have in reserve status, at any one time, either 2000 toll free numbers or 7.5 percent of that Responsible Organization's numbers in working status, whichever is greater.
- (b) A Responsible Organization shall never reserve more than 3 percent of the quantity of toll free numbers in spare status as of the previous Sunday at 12:01 a.m. Eastern Time.
- (c) The Wireline Competition Bureau shall modify the quantity of numbers a Responsible Organization may have in reserve status or the percentage of numbers in the spare poll that a Responsible Organization may reserve when exigent circumstances make such action necessary. The Wireline Competition Bureau shall establish, modify, and monitor toll free number conservation plans when exigent circumstances necessitate such action.

[62 FR 20127, Apr. 25, 1997, as amended at 67 FR 13226, Mar. 21, 2002]

§ 52.111 Toll free number assignment.

Toll free numbers shall be made available on a first-come, first-served basis unless otherwise directed by the Commission.

[63 FR 16441, Apr. 3, 1998]

APPENDIX TO PART 52—DEPLOYMENT SCHEDULE FOR LONG-TERM DATA-BASE METHODS FOR LOCAL NUMBER PORTABILITY

Implementation must be completed by the carriers in the relevant MSAs during the periods specified below:

Phase I-10/1/97-3/31/98

| Chicago, IL | 3 |
|------------------|--------|
| Philadelphia, PA | 4 |
| Atlanta, GA | 8 |
| New York, NY | 2 |
| Los Angeles, CA | 1 |
| Houston, TX | 7 |

| Minneapolis, MN | 12 |
|--------------------------------|----|
| Phase II—1/1/98-5/15/98 | |
| Detroit, MI | 6 |
| Cleveland, OH | 20 |
| Washington, DC | 5 |
| Baltimore, MD | 18 |
| Miami, FL | 24 |
| Fort Lauderdale, FL | 39 |
| Orlando, FL | 40 |
| Orlando, FL Cincinnati, OH | 30 |
| Tampa, FL | 23 |
| Boston, MA | 9 |
| Riverside, CA | 10 |
| San Diego, CA | 14 |
| Dallas, TX | 11 |
| St. Louis, MO | 16 |
| Phoenix, AZ | 17 |
| Seattle, WA | 22 |
| Phase III—4/1/98-6/30/98 | |
| Indianapolis, IN | 34 |
| Milwaukee, WI | 35 |
| Columbus, OH | 38 |
| Pittsburgh, PA | 19 |
| Newark, NJ | 25 |
| Norfolk, VA New Orleans, LA | 32 |
| New Orleans, LA | 41 |
| Charlotte, NC | 43 |
| Greensboro, NC | 48 |
| Nashville, TN | 51 |
| Las Vegas, NV | 50 |
| Nassau, NY Buffalo, NY | 13 |
| Buffalo, NY | 44 |
| Orange Co, CA | 15 |
| Oakland, CA | 21 |
| San Francisco, CA | 29 |
| Rochester, NY | 49 |
| Kansas City, KS | 28 |
| Fort Worth, TX | 33 |
| Hartford, CT Denver, CO | 46 |
| Denver, CO | 26 |
| Portland, OR | 27 |
| Phase IV—7/1/98-9/30/98 | |
| Grand Rapids, MI | 56 |
| Dayton, OH | 61 |
| Akron, OH | 73 |
| Gary, IN | 80 |
| Bergen, NJ | 42 |
| Middlesex, NJ | 52 |
| Monmouth, NJ Richmond, VA | 54 |
| Richmond, VA | 63 |
| Memphis, TN | 53 |
| Louisville, KY | 57 |
| Jacksonville, FL | 58 |
| Raleigh, NC | 59 |
| West Palm Beach, FL | 62 |
| Greenville, SC | 66 |
| Honolulu, HI | 65 |

Providence, RI

Albony NV

| Albany, NY | 64 |
|------------------------------|-----|
| San Jose, CA | 31 |
| Sacramento, CA | 36 |
| Fresno, CA | 68 |
| Fresno, CA | 37 |
| Oklahoma City, OK | 55 |
| Austin, TX | 60 |
| Salt Lake City, UT | 45 |
| Tucson, AZ | 71 |
| Phase V-10/1/98-12/31/98 | |
| Toledo, OH | 81 |
| Youngstown, OH | 85 |
| Ann Arbor, MI | 95 |
| Fort Wayne, IN | 100 |
| Scranton, PA | 78 |
| Allentown, PA | 82 |
| Harrisburg, PA | 83 |
| Jersey City, NJ | 88 |
| Wilmington, DE | 89 |
| Birmingham, AL | 67 |
| Knoxville, KY | 79 |
| Baton Rouge, LA | 87 |
| Charleston, SC | 92 |
| Sarasota, FL | 93 |
| Mobile, AL | 96 |
| Columbia, SC | 98 |
| Tulsa, OK | 70 |
| Syracuse, NY | 69 |
| Springfield, MA | 86 |
| Ventura, CA | 72 |
| Bakersfield, CA | 84 |
| Stockton, CA | 94 |
| Vallejo, CA | 99 |
| El Paso, TX | 74 |
| Little Rock, AR | 90 |
| Wichita, KS | 97 |
| New Haven, CT | 91 |
| Omaha, NE | 75 |
| Albuquerque, NM | 76 |
| Tacoma, WA | 77 |
| [62 FR 18295, Apr. 15, 1997] | |
| ,,,,,, | |

PROVISIONS PART 53—SPECIAL CONCERNING BELL OPERATING COMPANIES

Subpart A—General Information

53.1 Basis and purpose.

53.3 Terms and definitions.

Subpart B—Bell Operating Company Entry into InterLATA Services

Subpart C—Separate Affiliate; Safeguards

53.201 Services for which a section 272 affiliate is required.

53.203 Structural and transactional requirements.

53.205 Fulfillment of certain requests. [Reserved]

53.207 Successor or assign.

53.209 Biennial audit. 53.211 Audit planning.

53.213 Audit analysis and evaluation.

Subpart D—Manufacturing by Bell **Operating Companies**

53.301 [Reserved]

Subpart E—Electronic Publishing by Bell **Operating Companies**

53.401 [Reserved]

Subpart F—Alarm Monitoring Services

53.501 [Reserved]

Authority: Sections 1-5, 7, 201-05, 218, 251, 253, 271–75, 48 Stat. 1070, as amended, 1077; 47 U.S.C. 151-55, 157, 201-05, 218, 251, 253, 271-75, unless otherwise noted.

Source: 62 FR 2967, Jan. 21, 1997, unless otherwise noted.

Subpart A—General Information

§53.1 Basis and purpose.

(a) Basis. The rules in this part are issued pursuant to the Communications Act of 1934, as amended.

(b) Purpose. The purpose of the rules in this part is to implement sections 271 and 272 of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, 47 U.S.C. 271 and

§53.3 Terms and definitions.

Terms used in this part have the following meanings:

Act. The Act means the Communications Act of 1934, as amended.

Affiliate. An affiliate is a person that (directly or indirectly) owns or controls, is owned or controlled by, or is under common ownership or control with, another person. For purposes of this part, the term "own" means to own an equity interest (or the equivalent thereof) of more than 10 percent.

AT&T Consent Decree. The AT&T Consent Decree is the order entered August 24, 1982, in the antitrust action styled United States v. Western Electric, Civil Action No. 82-0192, in the United States District Court for the District of Columbia, and any judgment or order